

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

A replacement sheet containing Figs. 1 and 2 is enclosed. Fig. 1 has been amended to include a new reference numeral 30 to designate a longitudinal rib formed on the top wall 6. In Fig. 2, the lead line for reference numeral "15" is extended to point to the corresponding supporting surface. The amendment to Fig. 2 is supported by illustration of an additional support surface 18 in the same figure. No new matter has been added.

Attachments: Replacement sheet (Figs. 1 and 2)

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 14-16, 18-19, 21, 23-27 are pending in this application with claim 14 being the only independent claim. Claims 1-13, 17, 20, and 22 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Independent claim 14 has been amended to recite partial claim features in the previously presented claims 20 and 22. Claims 21 and 23-26 have been amended in light of the amendments to independent claim 14. New claim 27 has been added reciting partial claim features in the previously presented claim 23. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration of the subject application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is hereby respectfully requested.

### **Overview of the Office Action**

Claims 14-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 3,247,893 to Ford .

Claims 24-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford in view of US 1,178,555 to Thomson.

### **Summary of the Subject Matter Disclosed in the Specification**

The following descriptive details are based on the specification. They are provided only for the convenience of the Examiner as part of the discussion presented herein, and are not intended to argue limitations which are unclaimed.

The present specification discloses a slide channel 1 for a slide member 2 of a door closer with a housing 3. The housing 3 has a support wall 4, an end wall 5 disposed opposite the support wall 4, and a top wall 6 connecting the support wall 4 and the end wall 5. A longitudinal slot 8 disposed opposite the top wall 6 and extending over the entire housing length. *See*, para. [0012] of published specification (US 2008/0229542).



Ford teaches a structural device, such as a drapery rod structure including inner and outer rod members 21, 22. In Figs. 2 and 3 of Ford, the inner rod member 21 is shown to have longitudinal ridges formed on the upper and lower walls and protruding into the internal chamber. Ford does not otherwise discuss about these longitudinal ridges.

The Office Action interprets the longitudinal ridges in Ford to be the longitudinal ribs recited in the claims. For example, when rejecting claim 20, which has been incorporated in the amended independent claim 14, the Office Action refers to Ford's longitudinal ridge on the upper wall (hereinafter "upper ridge") to be the first longitudinal rib of the invention. Without admitting or disputing the above interpretation made in the Office Action, applicants respectfully submit that the upper ridge in Ford does not read on the first longitudinal rib recited in independent claim 14.

Independent claim 14, as currently stands, incorporates part of the claim features in the previously presented claim 22 and explicitly recites that "the first longitudinal rib having a third guiding surface extending substantially perpendicularly to the first guiding surface." When rejecting claim 22, the Office Action states that Ford's upper wall is perpendicular to the upper ridge surface (see, Illustration 22a on page 5 of the Office Action). Applicants submit that such interpretation is not supported by the disclosure of Ford.

There is no teaching in Ford that its upper ridge is formed with a surface perpendicular to the upper wall. In fact, Ford does not even discuss the upper ridge in the specification or designate the upper ridge with a numeral reference in the drawing figures. In Figs. 2 and 3 of Ford, the upper ridge (located above the numeral reference "56" in Fig. 3) is shown to have a pointed tip. Consequently, the interpretation made in the Office Action contradicts to the teachings of Ford. Accordingly, Ford does not teach that "the first longitudinal rib having a third guiding surface extending substantially perpendicularly to the first guiding surface", as expressly recited in independent claim 14.

The first longitudinal rib recited in independent claim 14 is provided to define an inner chamber (7), which in turn is used to accommodate a slide member (2) and allow the same to slide inside the slide channel (1). The guiding surface on the first longitudinal rib so formed can promote the above correlation between the slide member (2) and the slide channel (1).

Ford provides no teaching or suggestion to one skilled in the art to carry out any modification needed to arrive at the claimed invention.

In view of the above, independent claim 14 patentably distinguishes over Ford. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 14 is hereby respectfully requested.

#### Dependent Claims 15-16, 18-19, and 21-27

Claims 15-16, 18-19, and 21-27 depend, directly or indirectly, from allowable independent claim 14. Thomson is cited in the Office Action against the additional features in claims 25-26 but do not remedy the deficiencies of Ford. Therefore, claims 15-16, 18-19, and 21-27 are each allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 14 is allowable.

In addition, claims 15-23 and 25-26 include features which serve to even more clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art of record.

For example, claim 23 recites that “wherein the end wall comprises a second projection extending over the entire length of the housing and projecting into the inner chamber, the second projection having a fifth guiding surface and the top wall forms a sixth guiding surface of the plurality of guiding surface, the fifth and sixth guiding surfaces being perpendicular to the second guiding surface of the end wall.” When rejecting claim 23, the Office Action consider Ford’s right-side lower wall to be perpendicular to bottom wall (see, Illustration 22a on page 5 of the Office Action). Such interpretation directly contradicts to a prior interpretation made in the Office Action in connection with claim 15, where the right-side upper wall is considered “downwardly curved.” In view of the above, amended claim 23 is allowable for the above additional reasons.

New claim 27 recites each of the guiding surfaces 9-14 and each of the supporting surfaces 15-20 shown in the drawings. For fails to disclose such an arrangement.

### **Conclusion**

Based on all of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in proper condition for allowance. Prompt and favorable action to this effect and early passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have any comments, questions, suggestions or objections, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned in order to facilitate reaching a resolution of any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,  
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By /Alfred W. Froebrich/  
Alfred W. Froebrich  
Reg. No. 38,887  
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210  
New York, New York 10176  
(212) 687-2770

Dated: January 23, 2009

Enclosure